

# Communities of Opportunity Interim Governance Group

## Meeting Notes

---

*January 22, 2015 1:00-4:00pm*

*Location: Pacific Hospital Preservation and Development Offices  
1200 12<sup>th</sup> Ave., S. Quarters 2, Seattle, WA 98144*

### **Members Present:**

*Adam Taylor, Adrienne Quinn, Betsy Jones, Deanna Dawson, Gordon McHenry, Hilary Franz, Jeff Natter, Michael Brown, Michael Woo, Patty Hayes, Scarlett Aldebot-Green, Sili Savusa, Tony To*

**Staff Present:** *Aaron Robertson, AJ McClure, Alice Ito, Bao-Tram Do, Cheryl Markham, Kirsten Wysen, Nadine Chan (on the phone)*

### **Guests:**

*Van Badzik*

## **Welcome and Introductions**

Alice Ito welcomed the group to the Pacific Hospital PDA, thanked Jeff Natter for hosting meeting and asked Jeff to share background on Pacific Hospital PDA. Alice informed the group that Michael Brown is chairing the meeting.

Michael introduced new IGG representative from the King County Council, Scarlett Aldebot-Green (Central Council staff for the Health, Housing and Human Services Committee) and meeting facilitator, Van Badzik (King County Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget)

Van Badzik led group introductions asking meeting attendees to share their name, work place, and memory about childhood/where they grew up.

Michael set the context for the meeting. As initiative is growing with support from Best Start for Kids levy funding it is important for IGG to identify its true North as a collective effort. In 3-5 years what does the group want to achieve as a collective table? How do we use our collective knowledge and expertise through joint visioning and strategic planning to benefit not just our place-based sites but everyone in the King County region?

## **Meeting Facilitation: Group Agreements, Frame for Consensus, and Meeting Goals**

Van went over the Group Agreements, Frame for Consensus, and Meeting Goals.

### Group Agreements

Respect the speaker  
All ideas are welcome  
Free to disagree  
Start and end on time

Be present  
Confidentially  
Step up, step back  
Speak from the “I”

### Frame for Consensus

Green - I think this is the best and only solution  
Yellow - I can live with it and support it  
Red - I do not agree and do not support

### Meeting Goals

- Catch up on recent developments at the King County Council
- Review Communities of Opportunity and Best Start for Kids timelines for 2016
- Develop a shared vision for Communities of Opportunity in five years
- Discuss and further develop initial governance composition, roles and infrastructure considerations; next steps for adoption

Van went over the meeting goals and asked what other subjects should be discussed. Added objective: Fun.

## **Updates and Developments from King County Council**

### Best Start for Kids and Community of Opportunities Ordinance

- With the Best Start for Kids (BSK) levy passed by voters, the COO IGG is tasked with developing a plan for the transition from an interim governance group to a permanent governance group that makes recommendations for the use of the COO element of the Best Starts for Kids Levy funding through an Implementation and Governance Structure Plan that is due to council by June 1, 2016.
- IGG needs to remain aware of public disclosure laws and if and when they will apply.
- With additional dollars and expansion, IGG wants to continue to uphold the integrity of the community driven process and elevate the collective impact aspect of the work.

### Executive and Council Appointees

- Executive appointee is Betsy Jones (Health and Human Potential Policy Advisor to King County Executive) and council appointee is Scarlett Aldebot-Green (Central Council staff for the Health, Housing and Human Services Committee)

### BSK Ordinance Amendment to include Community Appointees

- Councilmembers were supportive of the existing structure for COO but approved an amendment proposed by Councilmember Larry Gossett that requires two community appointees on the IGG, and for the permanent governance group “community appointees equal in numbers to at least two persons, or twenty percent of the total number of members, whichever is greater” (Line 103-105). Community appointees are defined as “grassroots organizers or activists” (Line 79) and “live in or have worked in a community the characteristics of which would qualify it for funding” (Line 82-83).

- Councilmember Gossett felt that the existing community members were over-represented in an Executive Director role and institutions, and felt that the advisory committee would benefit from community members that are also tax-payers but are not residents of the current funded sites.
- Community appointees could represent sites that qualify for COO expansion but are not indicative of future site selections.

A discussion ensued, which touched on the following points:

- Questions about qualifications and experience of new appointees, what are the skill sets and capabilities that will help with the IGG work?
- Questions about whether or not current community and site-based representatives qualify as community activist and could serve in the role of community appointee in permanent governance structure.
- Clarification that nothing in ordinance outlines voting structure.
- IGG members expressed understanding the good intention behind the amendment, making room for additional community voice but had a number of concerns, such as:
  - 1) IGG members expressed concerns about introducing new members who do not have the background and history of being a part of the initiative, will have to catch them up.
  - 2) IGG members expressed concerns about the lack of time and outreach to community and site based representatives on ordinance amendment. Missed opportunity to bridge knowledge gap and better inform King County Council on work and collaboration of IGG group.
  - 3) IGG members expressed concerns that process seems pushed by external pressures, requirements and timelines, and works against the initiative's goal of doing business differently, community-driven effort, collective impact.
  - 4) IGG members expressed concerns on perception that Executive Directors are out of touch with the community and in ivory towers.

### COO IGG Timeline Overview

Timeline document for first half of 2016 regarding BSK levy work was distributed.

Cheryl discussed the timeline for the next couple of months, looking at different pieces of the levy, breaking out things related to BSK, outline decision-making process, how pieces will move together, need for vetting the Implementation and Governance Structure Plan in April with Executive and stakeholders, strategic planning group will meet in between IGG meetings, policy systems change RFP review update with recommendation approvals in March, and upcoming Living Cities trip in Washington D.C. (March 22-23)

### Process and Timeline for Submitting Community Appointee Recommendations to King County Executive and Council

IGG members reached consensus on utilizing the subgroup to compile and vet community appointee recommendations. IGG members can join subgroup if interested. IGG members surfaced some recommendations of coalition partners who are members of site-based work but live in other regions not funded by COO.

IGG has not yet decided on expansion and does not want to be perceived as selecting appointees from areas that may get funding or will get funding, as we do not yet have a plan for expansion.

January 27<sup>th</sup>- IGG members send recommendations to Kirsten

January 28<sup>th</sup>- Subgroup meeting to discuss recommendations

February 1<sup>st</sup>- Founders phone call

February 5<sup>th</sup>- Discussions with Gossett's office completed and recommendations to King County Executive

February 15<sup>th</sup>- Motion due to Council with two selected appointees

**Visioning Exercise: Where do we want Communities of Opportunity to be in five years?  
How does this vision inform government structures?**

Van shared with IGG the results of the vision exercise in the subgroup, which discussed where we want COO to be in five years (2021). Seattle Times headlines. See January 21, 2016 subgroup notes.

Van led the IGG through COO (1) Place-Based Visioning and (2) Policy and Systems Visioning. Looking at where we are today, where we want to be in five years and what is the best path to get there. Members were asked to write five year report, what is happening at these places, headline indicators, and how are we getting there. One per post-it sticky. Members shared with larger group.

Place-Based Visioning- 2021

- Existing sites becoming mentors to new sites
- Sites building momentum in implementation plan
- Community members engaged and have their voices heard
- We have a clear system of performance indicators, data collection and tracking, and reporting for COO, sites, government and public
- Ethnic and cultural demographics in the Rainier Valley does not change
- SE Opportunity Center moving forward
- There are plans for a Graham Street Station
- People throughout King County know about and support COO
- Every COO site has access to healthy food
- Home ownership increase by 60% in White Center for current residents
- Healthy and affordable Housing stock increases and rent stabilization
- Increased civic engagement
- More healthy housing options, and affordable in all five communities
- Large corporations are joining with public sector to support COO strategies
- Transformation is happening in the community by residents
- Current sites are resources supporting operations and coalition maintenance
- Approach is working so that there are more resources to put into prevention: policy changes and investments
- Residents in COO communities are satisfied with their COO experience
- Community owned COO initiative
- Community and council tie is strong in support

- Disparities in health, housing, and economic opportunities significantly reduced—on way to being eliminated
- Economic growth in all areas of King County
- Safe connection corridors
- Resident council voice in King County Comp Plan
- Learning is being spread, learning lab, spreading good news

## Discussion

- IGG members had questions on when we know COO can expand to other sites.
- There was emphasis on getting the current place-based work right before making investments in other sites so that we are not diluting impact.
- Place-based work is a means to an ends of achieving policy/systems change. Important also to focus on the policy and systems change pieces to get to the root issues for these communities.
- Looking at how we disrupt and rebuild the system
- Part of knowing the effectiveness of COO is looking at the capacity of the collective impact of governance group.
- Important to consider site readiness when we are looking at expansion. How are sites expressing their readiness?
- Also, important to consider our current investments in the two planning grant sites. Could they potentially be ready for larger COO investments? When?
- How can we leverage and connect existing parallel efforts (e.g., momentum in Auburn)
- How to involve Native American groups? How do we bring them in?

## Policy and Systems Visioning - 2021

- What does success look like? Both process outcomes and population indicator outcomes.
- Measureable positive change and headline indicators by Policy/System change (P&S) grantees – fitting P&S grantee work into COO Results framework
- King County adopts health, housing and equity policies in its comprehensive plan in 2016, cities in sites follow their lead and do the same
- Policy work involves community in the process, and is informed by communities, and in turn support the work of communities
- Community included in formative process of policy development
- Cultural competency is institutionalized and outcomes measured
- More young adults in elected positions
- Stronger aligned partnerships in health, housing, economic opportunity
- Conditions identified as result areas for COO communities have statistically improved
- Youth homelessness reaches zero in 2021
- Yearly reduction in juvenile offenders
- Policies explicitly address disproportionality, use data
- Policy-making bodies reflect communities
- Reduce unemployment in communities of color, with public agencies aligning strategies to address.
- Collective impact to address system barriers, grantees working across silos, policy/systems and environment; knit data together; share data

- Communities collecting and using their own data
- Checks and balances are in place to ensure that community involvement is paramount in government decision-making
- City and county policies aligned with community vision and support development of healthy communities
- Health reflected across all policies

## **COO Governance—Composition, Process and Infrastructure Options & Considerations**

Matrix document on COO governance infrastructure issues that was developed by the subgroup was distributed. Jeff presented highlights of recommendations: governance group purpose, shared results statement, roles and responsibilities, group size, membership, leadership, terms and renewals, qualifications, decision-making, conflict of interest process and management, meeting frequency, and staff needs. Van facilitated a discussion of the elements in the document.

### Discussion

- Governance size range (maximum 15 and minimum 10) seems limiting. Follow-up to decide on an appropriate number.
- 51% community-based & community organizations (8 seats with 15 total seats). Majority representation from community based organizations to reflect shift in power dynamic, ensure community driven process, genuine partnership, and community has voice. Some questions and discussion about this element. Not resolved.
- Process of transition to final governance group – ideas discussed
- Role of elected officials discussed and general consensus that IGG should not have elected officials directly on it.
- Need to have criteria, want to make sure new members have expertise, understanding of initiative, takes time to effectively participate in collective table.
- Concerned about half of group leaving at a time with two years terms staggered every other year.
- Turnover/transition
  - Two years not long enough?
  - Two three-year terms?
- IGG wants to avoid this body turning into just an advisory group, this is an important collective impact table, and can leverage partners to achieve things that government and philanthropy cannot achieve alone.
- IGG has specific seat requirements (e.g., King County and Seattle Foundation representatives) but will not have specific seats for elected officials.
- How do we treat funders who significantly invest in this work? What is their membership? Don't want a set on IGG to be automatic
- Composition of group should reflect what we are trying to accomplish, issue experts, nimbleness, community input, value add of different partners.
- General agreement that decisions should be made through a consensus process.

### **Next meetings, upcoming events and deadlines:**

\* Jan. 22, 2016; 2-4 p.m.

- \* Feb. 19, 2016; 2-4 p.m.—third Friday of the month
- \* Mar. 18, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- \* March 22-23, Living Cities Learning Community, Washington, DC
- \* Apr. 15, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- \* May 20, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- \* June 1, 2016 implementation due date for King County Council
- \* June 17, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- \* July 15, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- \* Aug. 19, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- \* Sept 16, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- \* October TBD, Living Cities Learning Community, West Coast location
- \* Oct. 21, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- \* Nov. 18, 2016; 2-4 p.m.
- \* Dec. 16, 2016; 2-4 p.m.

### **Interim Governance Group Members:**

1. Michael Brown, Seattle Foundation (SF)
2. Deanna Dawson, Sound Cities Association
3. David Fleming, PATH
4. Hilary Franz, Futurewise
5. Patty Hayes, Public Health-Seattle & King County (PHSKC)
6. Betsy Jones, Executive's Office, King County
7. Paola Maranan, The Children's Alliance
8. Gordon McHenry, Jr, Solid Ground
9. Jeff Natter, Pacific Hospital PDA
10. Adrienne Quinn, King County Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS)
11. Sili Savusa, White Center CDA
12. Adam Taylor, Global to Local
13. Tony To, HomeSight
14. Michael Woo, volunteer

### **COO Staff:**

Alice Ito, SF  
 Kirsten Wysen, KC, PHSKC  
 Cheryl Markham, KC, DCHS  
 Aaron Robertson, SF  
 Nadine Chan, Evaluation, KC, PHSKC  
 AJ McClure, KC, DCHS and PHSKC  
 Sharon Bogan, Communications, KC, PHSKC  
 Bao-Tram Do, SF  
 Holly Rohr Tran, KC, PHSKC